Kenneth J. Abere, Jr., OSB No. 942345

KAbere@cosgravelaw.com

COSGRAVE VERGEER KESTER LLP

900 SW Fifth Avenue, 24<sup>th</sup> Floor

Portland, Oregon 97204

Telephone: (503) 323-9000 Facsimile: (503) 323-9019

Attorneys for Defendant Grizzly Industrial, Inc.

# UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

#### DISTRICT OF OREGON

#### **EUGENE DIVISION**

JACOB RAPANT,

Case No. 6:22-cv-1200

Plaintiff,

v.

GRIZZLY INDUSTRIAL, INC., a foreign business corporation,

Defendant.

NOTICE OF REMOVAL OF ACTION

**DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL** 

Defendant Grizzly Industrial, Inc. ("Grizzly") removes this action pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §§ 1441 and 1446.<sup>1</sup> This Court has diversity jurisdiction of this case because it is a civil action between citizens of different states and the amount in controversy exceeds \$75,000. This action should therefore proceed before this Court.

### I. BACKGROUND

1. On July 6, 2022, Plaintiff Jacob Rapant filed a Complaint, Case Number 22CV22340, in the Circuit Court of Marion County, Oregon (the "Complaint"). In the Complaint,

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> By filing this notice, Grizzly does not waive, and specifically reserves, all defenses and exceptions to this action.

Case 6:22-cv-01200-AA Document 1 Filed 08/15/22 Page 2 of 6

Plaintiff asserts products liability claims against Grizzly.

2. A true and correct copy of all process, pleadings, and orders served on Grizzly in

Case Number 22CV22340 in the Circuit Court of Marion County, Oregon, is attached hereto as

Exhibit A.

3. This Court has diversity jurisdiction over this matter pursuant to 28 U.S.C.

§ 1332(a)(1) because it is a civil action between citizens of different States and the amount in

controversy exceeds the sum of \$75,000. See 28 U.S.C. § 1332(a)(1) (granting federal district

courts jurisdiction over "all civil actions where the matter in controversy exceeds the sum or value

of \$75,000, exclusive of interest and costs, and is between...citizens of different States").

II. <u>DIVERSITY JURISDICTION</u>

**A.** The Parties Are Diverse

4. Based on the allegations of the Complaint, Plaintiff is a citizen of Oregon for

diversity purposes. Complaint at ¶ 5.

5. The Complaint correctly states Grizzly is a Washington Corporation. See

Complaint at ¶ 3. Grizzly is incorporated in the state of Washington and maintains its principal

place of business in Washington. See id.; Washington Secretary of State Records, attached hereto

as Exhibit B. Accordingly, Grizzly is a citizen of Washington for the purposes of diversity

jurisdiction. See 28 U.S.C. § 1332(c)(1) ("[A] corporation shall be deemed to be a citizen of every

State...by which it has been incorporated and of the State...where it has its principal place of

business....").

6. Based on the foregoing, there is complete diversity of citizenship between the

parties.

Page 2 - **NOTICE OF REMOVAL OF ACTION** 

Cosgrave Vergeer Kester LLP 900 SW Fifth Avenue, 24<sup>th</sup> Floor Portland, Oregon 97204

Portland, Oregon 97204 Telephone: (503) 323-9000 Facsimile: (503) 323-9019 B. The Amount in Controversy Exceeds \$75,000

7. The amount in controversy requirement of 28 U.S.C. § 1332 is also satisfied.

Viewing Plaintiff's allegations as a whole and from the Plaintiff's perspective, the amount of

damages sought in this action exceeds \$75,000.

8. In determining whether the amount in controversy is met, "[t]he district court may

consider whether it is 'facially apparent' from the complaint that" the amount is met. Singer v.

State Farm Mut. Auto Ins. Co., 116 F.3d 373, 377 (9th Cir. 1997). "If not, the court may consider

facts in the removal petition, and may 'require the parties to submit summary-judgment-type

evidence relevant to the amount in controversy at the time of removal." Id.

9. "[C]ourts may use judicial experience and common sense in determining whether

it is facially apparent that the amount in controversy is satisfied, and courts should conduct an

independent appraisal of the allegations of the complaint." See Samsky v. State Farm Mut. Auto.

Ins. Co., No. 219CV00992CASJPRX, 2019 WL 1488737, at \*3 (C.D. Cal. Apr. 3, 2019).

10. The Complaint alleges Grizzly is responsible to Plaintiff for severe injuries Plaintiff

has allegedly sustained.<sup>2</sup> Specifically, the Complaint alleges four of Plaintiff's fingers were

"sever[ed]/partial[ly] sever[ed]" by products Grizzly manufactured and sold. Complaint at ¶ 21.

Attached as Exhibit 1 to the Complaint is an image allegedly showing the graphic extent of the

injuries to Plaintiff's injured hand. *Id.* at Ex. 1.

11. The Complaint alleges Plaintiff's injuries—the "severance/partial severance of 4"

fingers on Plaintiff's right hand"--"are permanent and degenerative in nature" and "have increased

his susceptibility to future injury" and "future osteoarthritis." *Id.* at  $\P\P$  21-22.

<sup>2</sup> Grizzly does not admit these allegations.

Page 3 - NOTICE OF REMOVAL OF ACTION

12. The Complaint seeks to recover judgment for non-economic damages "to be

determined by a reasonable jury" up to \$5,000,000. See id. at  $\P$  22.

13. Plaintiff's demand for damages up to \$5,000,000 indicates he is seeking damages

well beyond the \$75,000 jurisdictional threshold.

14. Additionally, Plaintiff's allegations concerning the nature and magnitude of his

injury confirm the amount in controversy requirement is satisfied. Given that Plaintiff is alleging

significant injuries to four of his fingers, it is foreseeable that a trier of fact could award him

damages he seeks in excess of \$75,000. See Villalba v. Rockford Sys., Inc., No. 02-CV-4455

(ARR)(RML), 2006 WL 526660, at \*1-2 (E.D.N.Y. Mar. 3, 2006) (awarding \$305,000 in damages

where a blade cut off portions of two fingers); see also Winfield v. Wal-Mart Stores, Inc., No.

214CV01034MMDCWH, 2016 WL 10807599, at \*2 (D. Nev. Sept. 9, 2016) (relying on the fact

that juries in factually similar cases had returned damages awards in excess of the amount

necessary to reach the jurisdictional threshold in that case to find the amount in controversy

requirement was satisfied).

15. Because the allegations in the Complaint establish that Plaintiff is seeking up to

\$5,000,000 in damages and that Plaintiff has suffered severe injuries to his hand for which a

significant recovery is foreseeable, it is "more likely than not" that the amount in controversy in

this case exceeds \$75,000. See Sanchez v. Monumental Life Ins. Co., 102 F.3d 398, 404 (9th Cir.

1996) ("[T]he defendant must provide evidence establishing that it is 'more likely than not' that

the amount in controversy exceeds [the jurisdictional threshold].").

16. The Court thus has original jurisdiction over this action pursuant to 28 U.S.C.

§ 1332, and Grizzly may remove this action to this Court pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §§ 1441(a) and

1446.

Page 4 - **NOTICE OF REMOVAL OF ACTION** 

III. CONCLUSION

A true and correct copy of this Notice of Removal will be filed with the Clerk of the Circuit

Court of Marion County, Oregon, as required by 28 U.S.C. § 1446. Concurrent with the filing of

this Notice of Removal, Grizzly has served Plaintiff with a copy of Grizzly's Notice of Removal

to Federal Court. A copy of this Notice, without exhibits, is attached hereto as Exhibit C.

WHEREFORE, Grizzly prays that Case Number 22CV22340 in the Circuit Court of

Marion County, Oregon, be removed to and proceed in this Court and that no further proceeding

be had in this case in the Circuit Court proceeding.

DATED: August 15, 2022

COSGRAVE VERGEER KESTER LLP

s/ Kenneth J. Abere, Jr.

Kenneth J. Abere, Jr., OSB No. 942345

KAbere@cosgravelaw.com

900 SW Fifth Avenue, 24th Floor

Portland, OR 97204

Telephone: 503-323-9000

Facsimile: 503-323-9019

Attorneys for Defendant Grizzly Industrial, Inc.

## **CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE**

I herel	by certify that I served a true and correct copy of the foregoing NOTICE OF
<b>REMOVAL OF ACTION</b> on the date indicated below by:	
	mail with postage prepaid, deposited in the US mail at Portland, Oregon,
	hand delivery,
	facsimile transmission,
	overnight delivery,
$\boxtimes$	electronic filing notification.
If served by facsimile transmission, attached to this certificate is the printed confirmation	
of receipt of the documents generated by the transmitting machine. I further certify that said	
copy was placed in a sealed envelope delivered as indicated above and addressed to said attorney	
at the address listed below:	
C. Aaron Johnson Ryan S. Jennings The Gatti Law Firm 235 Front St., SE, STE 200 Salem, OR 97301 cajohnson@gattilaw.com rsj@gattilaw.com Attorneys for Plaintiff	

DATED: August 15, 2022

s/ Kenneth J. Abere, Jr.
Kenneth J. Abere, Jr., OSB No. 942345